

**Technology Customer Council Meeting
Minutes of October 14, 2003**

F i n a l

Present: Steve Mosena, Judy Peters (on behalf of Steve Morris), Lee Tack, Rich Jacobs, Greg Wright, Carl Martin, Gary Nichols, Marvin Van Haaften

Absent: Steve Morris, Cynthia Eisenhauer, Leon Schwartz, Larry Murphy, Diane Kolmer

Guests: Nadir Mehta, John Gillispie, Kit Krogmeier, Marianne Mickelson, Lorrie Tritch, Mark Uhrin, Tom Shepherd, Doug Kern, Randy Clemenson, Diane Van Zante, Russ Rozinek, Denise Sturm, Randy Clemenson, Vicki O'Neal

- 1) Review and Approve Minutes – Steve Mosena called the meeting to order. A quorum of members was present. Greg Wright made a motion, seconded by Marv Van Haaften, that the minutes of the September meeting be approved. An oral vote was taken, approving the minutes as written.
- 2) Review and Approve Revised By-Laws – Council members were sent a revised copy of the bylaws containing requested changes. One of the members noted that the bylaws were silent about the terms of the chair and vice chair. After a period of discussion, Carl Martin made a motion, seconded by Greg Wright, that the chair and vice-chair be elected annually, at the first meeting of each new fiscal year. There was no additional discussion. An oral vote was taken and the motion approved. The council also agreed to accept alternate members, who had been designated by an agency director, without formal council approval. Information Technology Enterprise (ITE) staff reported back on an item from the last meeting regarding voting rights for legislative and judicial council members. If they choose to appoint members to serve on the council, those members do have voting rights. The bylaws will be revised again and brought back to the council for approval at the next meeting.
- 3) Review Revised List of ITE Mainframe Services – Lorrie Tritch presented a listing of ITE Mainframe Utility Services, including services that could be discontinued in the future. Those items were identified as such. The list will be the basis for ITE market analysis. ITE will work on a transition plan this fiscal year, but an actual implementation date is yet unknown.
- 4) Disaster Recovery – Steve Mosena stressed the importance of an enterprise disaster recovery effort. ITE is working on a business continuity plan. ITE has already achieved offsite storage back up its data center. Lorrie explained that the plan contains four basic components: 1) emergency replacement of equipment, 2) cold site space reserved, 3) work-around implementation planning, and 4) combine various “IT Emergency” type plans. ITE plans to coordinate efforts between Homeland Security, Bio-terrorism, and Cyber-security. Council members expressed the desire to stay abreast of other initiatives in these areas. Lorrie will follow-up at the next meeting. A question was raised about covering the costs of this effort. Assuming that disaster recovery and business continuity are mandatory, John

advised that ITE would embed associated costs in its rates. Steve Mosena believes that council members can play a significant role in educating other agencies about rate increases that result from disaster recovery/business continuity activities.

- 5) Mainframe Services Survey – The DAS IT Customer Council will be working with ITE to gather information on mainframe service utilization in state government and to determine what applications have been outsourced that are mainframe applications. This information is being collected to assist in the development of a statewide disaster recovery/business continuity plan. Further information will be forthcoming. Marianne Mickelson will be the central point of contact for responses. Council members felt there was some ambiguity with the definition of a “mainframe application.” The council reviewed a proposed survey instrument and subsequently suggested that the survey be sent out in the form of narrative questions rather than spreadsheet form.
- 6) Schedule for Future Meetings – The next meeting is tentatively set for November 12. ITE will poll for attendance and determine if that date works for the majority of the members. The December meeting has been scheduled for December 9. We hope to set meeting dates for 2004 at the November meeting.
- 7) PKI Update – Tom Shepherd reported that the Public Key Infrastructure (PKI) contract had been negotiated, but not yet signed. ITE revisited agency business requirements for PKI and received commitments for 148 PKI seats. Based on that finding, we asked Verisign to give us a quote for the purchase of 100 seats. Total FY04 expenses amounted to \$142,866. Total FY05 expenses came to \$124,410. At a level of 100 seats, annual cost per certificate, minus first year one time costs, would be \$1244.10 per certificate. Tom shared a “Year 1 Alternative to Charging Fully Loaded Costs” and an “Alternative to Implementation of Hosted PKI Service by the State of Iowa.” Tom also clarified that the State of Iowa is in technical compliance with Iowa Code 554D.120 (...“on or before July 1, 2003, a state executive branch agency, department, board, commission, authority, or institution, in consultation and cooperation with the information technology department, shall send and accept electronic records and electronic signatures to and from other persons and otherwise create, generate, communicate, store, process, use, and rely upon electronic records and signatures”....) and he has verified that with the Attorney General’s Office. Tom also explained the difference between an electronic signature and a digital signature (a digital signature is a specific type of electronic signature).

PKI has been defined as a utility service. Based upon the foregoing information, should ITE go ahead and implement or wait? Council members expressed an interest in disseminating the information to other agencies (not represented) to gather their input. It was also noted that the bylaws require a five-day notice on items that require council action. Additional questions arose as to whether agencies really needed digital signatures or if another form of secure transmission would suffice. That would hinge on the agency’s business case. Steve Mosena suggested that the council share the information with member agencies and provide feedback at the next meeting. ITE was asked to consider the following scenario: if the Technology Customer Council was to set a rate of \$100 per certificate and sell approximately 100 certificates, where would the rest of the money come from and what

would happen if that source of money fell through the following year? Council members noted that the recent 2.5% across the board cut and high cost per certificate would likely have a significant impact on the number of seats requested. John Gillispie recommended that ITE share the complete business case with the council and have council members visit with their partner agencies, discuss those comments at the next meeting and then come to a decision. Steve will apprise the agencies via e-mail.

8) Other, Wrap-Up, and Adjourn –

Items for the next meeting:

- * Discuss expectations (of the council and of ITE). Who does what?
- * What is and isn't considered a utility and how does federal over-recovery impact that?

Judy Peters made a motion, seconded by Greg Wright, that the meeting be adjourned. The meeting was adjourned at 3:06.